

**Source Selection Statement for the
Information Technology and Multimedia Services Contract
NASA Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center
(Solicitation Number NNJ09244782R)**

On August 5, 2010, along with other senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) Johnson Space Center (JSC), I met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the JSC Information Technology and Multimedia Services (ITAMS) Request for Proposal (RFP), Solicitation Number NNJ09244782R. The presentations charts represent the final source selection evaluation report and are herein incorporated by reference.

I. Background

The ITAMS contract provides a variety of institutional information technology, multimedia, information management and external relations support services at the Johnson Space Center, primarily under the management of the JSC Information Resources Directorate with participation by the JSC Office of External Relations. Specifically, these include:

- Operation and maintenance of primary information technology services at JSC (servers, networks)
- IT Security support
- Application Development
- Graphics; library management; imagery acquisition, processing, cataloging
- Television systems support for human space flight missions and institutional needs
- Public Affairs services including creative content for NASA TV, live mission television, multimedia, public web
- Education Program support
- Financial Systems support
- Program and Institutional IT support

The contract type is Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Cost Plus Incentive Fee. The procurement was conducted as a 100% small business set aside. The basic period of performance for this acquisition is 3 years, from November 1, 2010 through October 31, 2013. There are two 1-year options. The Not-To Exceed (NTE) for the basic IDIQ effort is \$150.5 million. The first 1-year option provides a \$50.5 million addition to the basic IDIQ NTE value. The second 1-year option provides a \$ 50.5 million addition to the basic IDIQ NTE value. The acquisition includes work previously performed under the JSC Information Management and Media Services (JIMMS) contract, the JSC Enabling Technologies and Security (JETS) contract and portions of information technology related work performed under several other JSC contracts.

The products and services provided by the ITAMS contract are required for general information technology and multimedia services supporting NASA's human space flight programs, exploration and science programs and the Johnson Space Center institutional operations. The

major activities on the ITAMS contract include IT Application services including full system life cycle support for new and existing application capabilities as well as databases and database product administration, writing editing and graphics, public affairs multimedia services, and facility management of IT support facilities.

An Industry Day was held January 20, 2009 and included one-on-one presentations by industry to the voting members of the SEB. A draft statement of work was issued on January 30, 2009.

The contracting officer released a draft Request for Proposal (RFP) on August 12, 2009. A pre-proposal conference and facility tour were held August 25, 2009. Questions regarding the draft RFP were submitted to the Government by potential offerors by September 4, 2009 and answers were provided and posted to the ITAMS web site on October 5, 2009. Questions regarding the final RFP were due from potential offerors by October 21, 2009 and answers were posted to the ITAMS website in Amendment 2 on November 6, 2009. The final RFP was issued via the Internet on October 14, 2009.

The procurement was conducted as a small business set-aside. The RFP divided the proposals into four volumes with two different due dates. Volume II, related to past performance, was due on October 28, 2009. Volume I, related to mission suitability, Volume III, related to cost/price, and Volume IV, related to the model contract, were due on December 2, 2009. Timely proposals were received from the following seven companies:

- Yang Enterprises, Inc.
- DB Consulting Group, Inc. (DB Consulting)
- K-MAR Joint Venture (K-MAR)
- Caelum Research Corporation (Caelum)
- Beacon-Tessada Joint Venture (BTJV)
- GB Tech, Inc. (GB Tech)
- Anadarko Industries, LLC (Anadarko)

All of the offerors were small businesses within the definition provided in the relevant NAICS Code at the time of proposal submittal. Each "offeror" included a qualifying small business leading a team of other companies of varying sizes and specialization.

The RFP stated that the proposals would be evaluated in accordance with the following factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price as provided for in Section M of the RFP. Each proposal received a mission suitability score based on the following subfactors and associated numerical weights. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

Subfactor 1:	Technical	500 points
Subfactor 2:	Management	250 points
Subfactor 3:	Staffing/Key Personnel	150 points
Subfactor 4:	<u>Safety and Health</u>	<u>100 points</u>
Total		1000 points

The mission suitability subfactors were evaluated and assigned an adjectival rating using the following scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

In addition to mission suitability, the RFP identified and the SEB evaluated past performance and cost/price factor. These were not numerically scored.

Since past performance can be a significant indicator of performance under the proposed contract, the past performance for each offeror (including past performance of teams members and major subcontractors) was evaluated. The evaluation assessed corporate past performance on other contracts comparable to the ITAMS contract and was based on information provided by the offerors in their proposals and past performance questionnaires, as well as other information obtained independently by the SEB to include contacting organizations for which the Offeror and major subcontractor have previously performed work and data from the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System. Past performance was evaluated and rated using the following scale: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral. Both the quality of performance and the relevance of the work to the ITAMS contract were considered. Relevant experience is defined as the accomplishment of work that is comparable or related to the work required under this procurement.

Under the cost/price factor, the Government performed a price and cost analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305 and NASA FAR supplement (NFS) 1815.305 and 1815.370, to include a cost realism analysis and cost confidence level. As part of the analysis, information proposed in Volume III, Cost/Price, and in Volume I, Mission Suitability was evaluated to determine whether the estimated cost elements were (1) valid, (2) realistic for the work to be performed, (3) and adequate for the work to be performed. The proposed and probable costs for the entire potential period of performance (contract years 1- 5) were evaluated. If and to the extent that an Offeror proposed to hire some or all of the incumbent workforce, and stated on the total compensation template (e) their intent to maintain current incumbent direct labor rates, the probable cost included adjustments to correspond with the offeror's approach to pay incumbent employees. The evaluation of the cost factor will result in a probable cost which may differ from the proposed cost and reflects the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal. Each proposal was assessed a cost/price level of confidence by the SEB. The cost/price confidence levels utilized were: High, Medium and Low.

As provided in the RFP, of the three evaluation factors, mission suitability and past performance when combined are significantly more important than cost. Mission suitability is more important than past performance.

II. Evaluation of Initial Proposals

After a preliminary review of all proposals, the Board determined that all seven proposals were acceptable. The evaluation process was conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815 as well as the RFP. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to me, the source selection authority (SSA) on April 23, 2010, and are summarized below in alphabetical order.

Anadarko Industries (Anadarko)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, Anadarko received a total point score of 704 out of 1000 points. Anadarko received 2 significant strengths, 23 strengths, 1 significant weakness, and 33 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, Anadarko received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 13 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 23 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, Anadarko received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, 7 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 7 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, Anadarko received an adjectival rating of "Good," having 1 significant strength, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and 2 weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, Anadarko received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Cost Factor, Anadarko's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$192.29 million and the Government's probable cost was \$180.90 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the Anadarko team was adjusted downward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in Anadarko's probable cost due to various concerns with Anadarko and its major subcontractors' initial cost volumes. For example, there were concerns associated with the rationale for the Anadarko team's proposed resources, direct labor rates, minor errors and DCAA findings (errors in the Prime and one of the major subcontractors Overhead and G&A rates). The Anadarko team did not provide substantive rationale for the resources allocated to the task orders, nor did they explain how they arrived at the BOE for their proposed labor estimates. Also there were discrepancies between the Anadarko team's Section B Fully Burdened Labor Rates in the model contract and the Cost Templates in the cost volume of the proposal. There were also other issues where the SEB needed more data to verify the offeror's intent in accordance with their accounting systems and management approach.

Under the Past Performance Factor, Anadarko had an adjectival rating of "High." Anadarko had 1 significant strength, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Beacon-Tessada Joint Venture (BTJV)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, BTJV received a total point score of 747 out of 1000 points. BTJV received 3 significant strengths, 30 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 20 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, BTJV received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 2 significant strengths, 19 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 13 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, BTJV received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 9 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 7 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, BTJV received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, BTJV received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses.

Under the Cost Factor, BTJV's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$198.97 million and the Government's probable cost was \$192.24 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the BTJV team was adjusted downward. The Government had a low level of confidence in the probable cost. The SEB had various concerns with BTJV and its major subcontractors' initial cost volumes. For example, there were concerns associated with the lack of substantive rationale for the allocation of the BTJV team's proposed resources, direct labor rates, errors, and DCAA findings (BTJV major subcontractor had an Estimating Deficiency due to an unsupported G&A base). Other concerns included situations in which the SEB needed more data to verify the offeror's intent in accordance with their accounting systems and management approach.

Under the Past Performance Factor, Beacon- Tessada had an adjectival rating of "High." BTJV had 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Caelum Research Corporation Caelum)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, Caelum received a total point score of 752 out of 1000 points. Caelum received 5 significant strengths, 23 strengths, 3 significant weaknesses and 25 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, Caelum received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 3 significant strengths, 10 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 15 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, Caelum received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 2 significant strengths, 10 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 7 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, Caelum received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 3 weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, Caelum received an adjectival rating of "Poor," having no significant strengths, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and no weaknesses.

Under the Cost Factor, Caelum's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$175.46 million and the Government's probable cost was \$185.88 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the Caelum Team was adjusted upward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in the initial probable cost due to various concerns with Caelum and its major subcontractors' initial cost volumes. For example, there were concerns associated

with the rationale for the Caelum team's proposed resources, direct labor rates, escalation and DCAA findings (one of Caelum's Major Subcontractors had errors in the calculation of their indirect rates and one of Caelum's major subcontractors lacked verifiable estimate for their proposed overhead labor). There were discrepancies between the Caelum team's Section B Fully Burdened Labor Rates in the model contract and the Cost Templates in the cost volume of the proposal. Other issues included situations in which the SEB needed more data to verify the offeror's intent in accordance with their accounting systems and management approach.

Under the Past Performance Factor, Caelum had an adjectival rating of "moderate." Caelum had 1 significant strength, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and 2 weaknesses.

DB Consulting Group (DB Consulting)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, DB Consulting received a total point score of 849 out of 1000 points. DB Consulting received 6 significant strengths, 25 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 20 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, DB Consulting received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 3 significant strengths, 11 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 9 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, DB Consulting received an adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 2 significant strengths, 11 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 7 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, DB Consulting received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, DB Consulting received an adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 1 significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses and 3 weaknesses.

Under the Cost Factor, DB Consulting's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$202.28 million and the Government's probable cost was \$199.6 million. The Government had a low level of confidence in the probable cost. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and fee combined for the DB Consulting Team was adjusted downward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in the initial probable cost due to various concerns with DB Consulting and its major subcontractors' initial cost volumes. For example, there were concerns associated with the rationale for the DB Consulting team's proposed resources, direct labor rates, escalation and DCAA findings (error in the calculation of the prime's indirect rates and the prime Accounting System was inadequate for accumulation & billing cost on Government contracts). Also, there were discrepancies between the DB Consulting's team Section B Fully Burdened Labor Rates in the model contract and the Cost Templates in the cost volume of the proposal. Other concerns included situations in which the SEB needed more data to verify the Offeror's intent in accordance with their accounting systems and management approach.

Under the Past Performance Factor, DB Consulting had an adjectival rating of "High." DB Consulting had 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

GB Tech

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, GB Tech received a total point score of 685 out of 1000 points. GB Tech received 4 significant strengths, 13 strengths, 2 significant weaknesses and 29 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, GB Tech received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 3 significant strengths, 9 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 22 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, GB Tech received an adjectival rating of "Fair," having no significant strengths, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and 5 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, GB Tech received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, GB Tech received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Cost Factor, GB Tech's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$190.83 million and the Government's probable cost was \$211.26 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the GB Tech team was adjusted upward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in the initial probable cost due to various concerns with GB Tech and its major subcontractor's initial cost volumes. For example, the SEB determined that the GB Tech's team's technical approach and basis of estimate did not provide sufficient rationale to support the resources allocated to the task orders. Also, there were concerns associated with the GB Tech team's proposed direct labor rates, errors, and DCAA findings (GB Tech's Major Subcontractor indirect rates were unsupported and invalid).

Under the Past Performance Factor, GB Tech had an adjectival rating of "Moderate." GB Tech had no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 3 weaknesses.

K-Mar Joint Venture (K-MAR)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, K-MAR received a total point score of 483 out of 1000 points. K-MAR received 1 significant strength, 21 strengths, 4 significant weaknesses and 31 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, K-MAR received an adjectival rating of "Good," having 1 significant strength, 17 strengths, 1 significant weaknesses and 22 weaknesses.

Under the Management Subfactor, K-MAR received an adjectival rating of "Fair," having no significant strengths, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and 7 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, K-MAR received an adjectival rating of "Poor," having no significant strengths, 1 strength, 2 significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, K-MAR received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness.

Under the Cost Factor, K-MAR's proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$179.71 million and the Government's probable cost was \$191.81 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and fee combined for the KMJV Team was adjusted upward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in the initial probable cost due to various concerns with KMJV and its major subcontractor's initial cost volumes. For example, the SEB determined that the KMJV's team technical approach failed to provide adequate rationale for the resources allocated to the five Task Orders. Also, there were concerns associated with the KMJV team's proposed direct labor rates, errors, and DCAA findings (prime and major subcontractor indirect rates were overstated).

Under the Past Performance Factor, K-MAR had an adjectival rating of "Low." K-MAR had no significant strengths, 1 strength, 1 significant weakness and no weaknesses.

Yang Enterprises

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, Yang Enterprises received a total point score of 378 out of 1000 points. Yang Enterprises received 1 significant strength, 11 strengths, no significant weaknesses, 28 weakness and 6 deficiencies across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, Yang Enterprises received an adjectival rating of "Poor," having no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses, 14 weaknesses and 6 deficiencies.

Under the Management Subfactor, Yang Enterprises received an adjectival rating of "Fair," having no significant strengths, 4 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 9 weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, Yang Enterprises received an adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 4 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 2 weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, Yang Enterprises received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses and 3 weaknesses.

Under the Cost Factor, Yang Enterprises' proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$202.12 million and the Government's probable cost was \$203.15 million. The initial probable IDIQ total cost and fee combined for the Yang Team was adjusted upward. The SEB had a low level of confidence in the initial probable cost due to various concerns with Yang and its major subcontractor's initial cost volumes. For example, the SEB determined that the rates provided in Section B of the model contract reflected only the prime's fully burdened labor rates. Yang's proposed fully burdened labor rates were adjusted to comply with Section M.4.3.1 Cost and Fee Evaluation of IDIQ. Also, there were concerns associated with the rationale for the Yang team's proposed resources (lack of rationale to support technical approach), direct labor rates, escalation and DCAA findings (error in calculation of prime indirect rates).

Under the Past Performance Factor, Yang Enterprises had an adjectival rating of "Low." Yang Enterprises had no significant strengths, 3 strengths, 1 significant weakness and no weaknesses.

Based on my review of the findings from the SEB, I determined that award on initial proposals was not appropriate, and I established a competitive range of the most highly rated proposals. The offerors determined to be included in competitive range were Anadarko Industries, LLC; BTJV; Caelum Research Corporation, and DB Consulting Group, Inc. I authorized the SEB to proceed with discussions leading to the submission of final proposal revisions (FPR) with these four offerors. All offerors were notified of their position inside or outside the competitive range by letter dated April 27, 2010. All three offerors not included in the competitive range have asked for post-award debriefings.

III. Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs)

A report was provided to each offeror remaining in the competitive range listing the weaknesses identified by the SEB during the initial evaluation phase. Offerors were invited to provide a written interim response addressing those weaknesses and to participate in oral discussions. All four remaining offerors submitted written responses to the weakness report. Prior to oral discussions the SEB reviewed the interim written response to determine whether weaknesses had been addressed (i.e., the offeror's written discussion provided evidence that the weakness had been resolved so that it would no longer be a weakness if the interim response was properly presented in the Final Proposal Revision.) Oral discussions were held May 13-19, 2010 with each offeror participating. Discussions closed on June 10, 2010. Offerors submitted revised model contracts on June 3, 2010 and Final Proposal Revisions on June 11, 2010.

The results of the final evaluations for the four proposals in competitive range are summarized below:

Anadarko Industries (Anadarko)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, Anadarko received a total point score of 768 out of 1000 points. Anadarko received 2 significant strengths, 24 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 8 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, Anadarko received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 13 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 7 weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the elimination of 17 of the initial 23 weaknesses. However, one weakness was added.

Under the Management Subfactor, Anadarko received a final adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, 7 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the elimination of the 7 initial weaknesses. The Offeror received a significant strength for proposing an exceptionally sound, feasible and efficient organizational structure with highly effective levels of approval and flow of authority that enables internal communications, reporting, and approval authority, as well as

external customer communications and interface. This organizational structure greatly increases the likelihood of successful implementation of contract requirements.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, Anadarko received a final adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included moving up 1 adjective rating with the addition of 1 strength for the proposed Information Management and External Relations Manager, the elimination of the significant weakness, and the elimination of the two initial weaknesses. In the evaluation of the initial proposal, the Offeror received a significant weakness for the proposed ITAMS Deputy Program Manager (DPM). The DPM's past performance made the candidate unqualified to assume the responsibilities of this extremely important position and the selection of this candidate greatly increases the likelihood of unsuccessful contractor performance and low customer satisfaction with the contract. In the FPR, the Offeror replaced the proposed Deputy Program Manager with an adequate candidate. The weakness was removed. Additionally, Anadarko received a significant strength for their proposed Program Manager who has highly pertinent, exceptional experience managing large and complex IT-related activities critical to the human space flight program for a major contractor at JSC. This proposed Program Manager provided a letter of commitment and her experience, references and management skills would add significant value to the ITAMS contract.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, Anadarko received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness. There was no change to the findings between initial and final evaluation.

Under the Cost Factor, Anadarko's final proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$181.39 million and the Government's final probable cost was \$187.11 million. The final probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the Anadarko team was adjusted upward. The upward adjustment resulted primarily from technical adjustments and a minor incumbent labor rate adjustment. The SEB had a high level of confidence in the final probable cost adjustment as a result of the Anadarko team adequately addressing all initial cost concerns during discussions which were addressed and corrected in their interim data submittal and the corrections were incorporated into their FPR. The SEB was also able to disposition several areas of concern. For example, the Anadarko team corrected their proposed direct labor rates and addressed all DCAA findings. The Anadarko team corrected the rates in Section B of the model contract to match the cost volume. Also, based on the Technical evaluation, Anadarko addressed the majority of the initial weaknesses by revising its staffing levels to match the team's technical approach. Although, Anadarko was assessed new weaknesses in the final evaluation due to inadequate rationale for certain WBS areas, the information provided was sufficient for the SEB to determine the appropriate staffing level needed to satisfy the SOW based on Anadarko's technical approach.

Under the Past Performance Factor, Anadarko had a final adjectival rating of "Very High." Anadarko had 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included moving up one adjective rating

with the addition of 1 strength and the elimination of 1 weakness. The Offeror received a significant strength for relevant experience and effective past performance. Anadarko demonstrated highly pertinent experience of exceptional merit in a broad range of work relevant to ITAMS including management, general customer support, information technology, and external relations support services. This relevant experience is of exceptional merit and is highly pertinent to the ITAMS acquisition, increasing the Government's confidence in successful performance of the required effort.

Beacon-Tessada Joint Venture (BTJV)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, BTJV received a total point score of 817 out of 1000 points. BTJV received 3 significant strengths, 30 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 3 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, BTJV received a final adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 2 significant strengths, 21 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 2 weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the addition of 2 strengths, the elimination of the significant weakness, and the elimination of 11 of the initial 13 weaknesses. The two new strengths were related to technical approaches in information technology areas. In the evaluation of initial proposals, the Offeror received a significant weakness for an inability to articulate an effective, sound, feasible, and efficient technical approach for supporting the JSC IT Governance Structure, which places IRD at risk of not meeting its IT investment compliance and reporting requirements. In the FPR, the Offeror includes specific board elements that are required in support of the JSC IT Governance structure and a description of specific elements that will be developed, maintained, updated, distributed, and audited in support of the JSC IT Governance structure. Hence, as previously stated, the significant weakness was removed.

The Offeror received a significant strength for proposing a sound, feasible, efficient and effective technical approach for the IT Systems Engineering, Installation, Maintenance and Operations (SOW 5.4) area. Its implementation will result in a substantially increased likelihood of successful contract execution in this area, provide the framework for exceptional service delivery, and result in significantly increased likelihood of customer satisfaction. The Offeror received a second significant strength for a feasible, sound, efficient and effective technical approach for supporting broad areas of Public Affairs Multimedia Support (WBS 8.1). This technical approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of its responsibilities, provides technically sound methods of managing fluctuating workload, and substantially increases the likelihood of successful contract performance in this area.

Under the Management Subfactor, BTJV received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 9 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the elimination of six of the seven initial weaknesses.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, BTJV received a final adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 1 significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. There was no change to the findings between initial and final evaluation. The Offeror received a significant strength for the proposed ITAMS Program Manager. The proposed Program

Manager for the BTJV Joint Venture has direct experience in the same role over much of the work included in the ITAMS contract and is very highly rated by references.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, BTJV received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 2 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. There was no change to the findings between initial and final evaluation.

Under the Cost Factor, BTJV's proposed final costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$200.92 million and the Government's final probable cost was \$202.04 million. The final probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the BTJV team was adjusted upward. The upward adjustment resulted primarily from minor technical adjustments made to Task Order #2, minor errors and a slight incumbent labor rate adjustment. The SEB had a high level of confidence in the final probable cost adjustment as a result of the BTJV team adequately addressing all initial cost concerns during discussions, which were addressed and corrected in their interim data submittal and the corrections were incorporated into their FPR. The SEB was able to disposition several areas of concern. For example, the BTJV team corrected their proposed direct labor rates and addressed all DCAA findings. Also, based on the technical evaluation, during discussion and in the FPR submittal, the BTJV team addressed the weaknesses associated with the labor categories by providing a sufficient explanation for the allocation of its proposed labor resources.

Under the Past Performance Factor, BTJV had a final adjectival rating of "High." BTJV had 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness. There was no change to the findings between initial and final evaluation. The Offeror received a significant strength for relevant experience and effective past performance. Team BTJV members Tessada and InDyne demonstrate highly pertinent, relevant experience covering a broad range of work under the ITAMS contract including support in the following areas: customer support center; specialized support services; customer service agent; application services; database administration; multimedia engineering, installation and maintenance; multimedia operations and services; information management; and external relations support services. This relevant experience is of exceptional merit and is highly pertinent to the ITAMS acquisition, increasing the Government's confidence in successful performance of the ITAMS contract.

Caelum Research Corporation (Caelum)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, Caelum received a total point score of 841 out of 1000 points. Caelum received 5 significant strengths, 24 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 10 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, Caelum received a final adjectival rating of "Very Good," having 3 significant strengths, 10 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 9 weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the elimination of the single significant weakness and the elimination of nine of the initial 15 weaknesses. However, 3 new weaknesses were added. In the FPR, the Offeror was able to address the concern expressed in the significant weakness regarding environmental requirements of imagery processing solutions. The Offeror proposed the ability to support the Zero-Discharge and chemical mix requirements as requested

in the SOW. The Offeror received a significant strength for an extremely sound, effective and efficient technical approach for General Customer Support (WBS 4.0) including an array of exceptional tools and processes which will increase the likelihood of effective service in this area. The Offeror received a second significant strength for proposing an effective, sound, feasible and efficient technical approach for meeting the requirements of IT Security, which thoroughly addresses the broad range of work in this area to an exceptional degree. The Offeror received a third significant strength for demonstrating a sound and effective technical approach for supporting Application Services (WBS 5.1), significantly increasing the likelihood of successful performance in this area of the contract.

Under the Management Subfactor, Caelum received a final adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 2 significant strengths, 10 strengths, no significant weakness and 1 weakness. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included moving up one adjective rating as the result of the elimination of the significant weakness and six of the seven initial weaknesses. In the FPR, the Offeror addresses the basis of the significant weakness regarding their overall management approach. The Offeror clarified the lines of communications and interaction between departments, the roles of the section manager and technical lead, responsibilities of the project lead, lines of communication and interaction between the project lead and the section/departments, and the interface between the ITAMS contract and the Government. The Offeror also eliminated all references to section supervisors. The significant weakness was eliminated. The Offeror received a significant strength for its proposed management tool which provides an extremely efficient and effective approach to managing work and resources on the ITAMS contract which will enable enhanced cost and project progress measurement for the contract. This will substantially reduce the risk to the Government for schedule, and content overruns by allowing easier identification of problems early enough for implementation of mitigating actions to be effective. The Offeror received a second significant strength in the management subfactor for providing an exceptionally effective and sound management approach for Configuration Management (CM), which includes key elements of a closed loop CM process. The Offeror's extremely effective CM management principles are a strong indicator of successful contract performance in this area and will contribute to contract success.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, Caelum received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the addition of one strength for the Offeror's proposed External Relations Manager and the elimination of three weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, Caelum received a final adjectival rating of "Good," having no significant strengths, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included moving up two adjective ratings with the elimination of the significant weakness. In the FPR, the offeror provided a new Safety and Health Plan that met the requirements which resulted in the removal of the significant weakness.

Under the Cost Factor, Caelum's final proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$183.73 million and the Government's final probable cost was \$181.28 million. The final probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for Caelum was adjusted downward. The

downward adjustment resulted from minor errors, a slight incumbent labor rate adjustment, and minor technical adjustments. The SEB had a high level of confidence in the final probable cost adjustment as a result of Caelum adequately addressing all initial cost concerns during discussions which were addressed and corrected in their interim data submittal and the corrections were incorporated into their FPR. The SEB was able to disposition several areas of concern. For example, Caelum corrected the rates in Section B of the model contract to match the cost volume. Caelum corrected their proposed direct labor rates and addressed all DCAA findings. Also, based on the technical evaluation, during discussion and in Caelum's FPR submittal, Caelum addressed the weaknesses associated with their proposed labor categories by better explaining and changing their proposed skill mix.

Under the Past Performance Factor, Caelum had a final adjectival rating of "High." Caelum had 1 significant strength, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness. The final evaluation changes included moving up one adjective rating with the elimination of the significant weakness and one of the two initial weaknesses. In the FPR, the Offeror provided additional past performance information regarding a team member's experience on the UNITes and MOMS contracts supporting NASA. Elements of these contracts are similar but not as extensive in scope and complexity as the WBS 8.0 area of ITAMS. The experience was, however, sufficient to remove the weakness. The Offeror received a significant strength for highly pertinent past performance of exceptional merit in a broad range of relevant areas of work increasing the Government's confidence in successful performance of the ITAMS Contract.

DB Consulting Group (DB Consulting)

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, DB Consulting received a total point score of 929 out of 1000 points. DB Consulting received 7 significant strengths, 29 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness across the four subfactors.

Under the Technical Subfactor, DB Consulting received a final adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 4 significant strengths, 12 strengths, no significant weaknesses and 1 weakness. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included moving up one adjective rating with one additional significant strength relating to the Offeror's technical approach to IT asset management, two additional strengths (one strength was removed to partially form the new significant strength), and the elimination of eight of the nine initial weaknesses. The final proposal had no significant weaknesses. The Offeror received a significant strength for demonstrating an effective, sound, feasible, and efficient technical approach for implementing Enterprise Architecture (EA) at the enterprise level which will help the Government comply with Agency directive NPD 2830.1, NASA Enterprise Architecture. The Offeror's EA approach demonstrated an understanding of the requirements and its exceptionally well-developed approach is a strong predictor of successful performance in this area of the contract. The Offeror received a second significant strength for a sound and effective approach for supporting Scenario 2, JSC IT Governance Framework, providing the Government with an exceptional quality process and methodology with effective automation that improves end-to-end board management and overall efficiency. The Offeror received a third significant strength for a sound and effective technical approach which provides staffing and resource efficiencies for External Relations Support Services (WBS 8.0), appreciably increasing the likelihood of successful contract

performance particularly during times of work surges. The Offeror received a fourth significant strength for an exceptionally effective, sound, feasible, and efficient technical approach for developing an integrated asset management solution in support of data center automation, software license management, automated asset discovery, impact relationships, and other areas of the contract. This technical approach substantially increases the likelihood of successful contract performance in these areas.

Under the Management Subfactor, DB Consulting received a final adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 2 significant strengths, 13 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes from the initial findings included the addition of two strengths and the elimination of all 7 initial weaknesses. The new strengths relate to the integration of contractor personnel from the partner companies into a cohesive operating unit and the placement of the IT Security organizational element to provide contract-wide IT Security focus. The Offeror received a significant strength under the management subfactor for its proposed phase-in plan, which is exceedingly sound and demonstrates an exceptionally effective and feasible approach to smoothly transitioning work from the incumbent. This plan will significantly increase the likelihood of successful contract performance at contract start. The Offeror received a second significant strength in this subfactor for its proposed approach for Configuration Management (CM), which is exceedingly sound and provides an exceptionally effective and feasible approach for CM that will significantly increase the likelihood of successful contract performance.

Under the Staffing/Key Personnel Subfactor, DB Consulting received a final adjectival rating of "Good," the same adjective as in the initial findings but with a small improvement within the "Good" range. The final evaluation changes included the elimination of one weakness leaving the Offeror with no significant strengths, 3 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses.

Under the Safety and Health Subfactor, DB Consulting received a final adjectival rating of "Excellent," having 1 significant strength, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes included the addition of one strength relating to demonstrated past safety and environmental performance and the elimination of three weaknesses. The Offeror received a significant strength for its Safety and Health Plan, which thoroughly addresses the requirements of DRD-9 of the ITAMS RFP and will significantly contribute to reducing and preventing injuries and illness among its employees.

Under the Cost Factor, DB Consulting's final proposed costs evaluated in accordance with the RFP were \$187.23 million and the Government's final probable cost was \$182.55 million. The final probable IDIQ total cost and target fee combined for the DB Consulting Team was adjusted downward. The downward adjustment resulted primarily from an incumbent labor rate adjustment. The SEB had a high level of confidence in the final probable cost as a result of DB Consulting adequately addressing all initial cost concerns during discussions which were addressed and corrected in their interim data submittal and the corrections were incorporated into their FPR. The SEB was able to disposition several areas of concern. For example, as a result of DB Consulting providing the details and appropriate level of resources needed to demonstrate their technical understanding of the ITAMS requirements all weaknesses identified with a resource adjustment during the initial evaluation were removed and there were no further

technical adjustments made during the final evaluation. DB Consulting corrected their proposed direct labor rates and addressed all DCAA findings. Also, DB Consulting corrected the rates in Section B of the model contract to match the cost volume.

Under the Past Performance Factor, DB Consulting had a final adjectival rating of "Very High." DB Consulting had 1 significant strength, 4 strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses. The final evaluation changes included the addition of 1 strength for past performance in WBS. 5.4.6, Multimedia Engineering, Installation and Maintenance, and the elimination of 1 weakness. The Offeror received a significant strength for highly pertinent experience of exceptional merit in General Customer Support and Information Technology work (WBS 4.0 and 5.0) relevant to ITAMS, which appreciably increases Government confidence in the Offeror's ability to successfully perform WBS 4.0 and WBS 5.0 requirements.

IV. Decision

Following the presentation by the SEB and the vigorous questioning of the SEB by me and my advisors, I fully considered the findings the SEB presented to me. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the proposals. I requested and received the opinions of the advisors present, and asked for their comments, objections or concerns with the materials presented to us. I accepted the findings of the SEB as they were presented to me. Following this discussion, I made a comparative assessment of the proposals based upon the evaluation factors in the solicitation – mission suitability, past performance, and cost/price.

Mission Suitability

I first considered the four proposals under the mission suitability factor. The relative importance of the evaluation factors weighed the non-cost/price factors as significantly more important than cost/price, and mission suitability more important than past performance. Among the mission suitability subfactors, the number of points assigned for evaluation purposes indicated that technical approach was more important than management, which in turn was more important than staffing/key personnel, which was more important than safety and health. The SEB's point and adjectival results for mission suitability signaled to me that there might be a qualitative advantage to DB Consulting in technical approach, safety and health and to a lesser degree management over the other offerors. This is where I began my inquiry and analysis.

First, in assessing the relative value of the mission suitability strengths, significant strengths and weaknesses of the four proposals in the technical subfactor, I performed an evaluation of the significant strengths and strengths, and their relative (positive) value to the Government. I then analyzed the weaknesses and their relative (negative) value and the risk they presented to the Government. This combination represented a comprehensive evaluation of the strengths, significant strengths and weaknesses. As in all factors and subfactors, I placed a significantly higher relative (positive) value for significant strengths in comparison to strengths. I placed a higher relative (negative) value for findings that addressed improper resource allocations. An offeror's lack of understanding of the proper resource allocation is an objective measure of an offeror's inability to successfully perform under the contract. Finally, I analyzed the estimated contract value for each applicable primary WBS element (i.e., 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, etc.) and placed a

higher relative value for findings associated with WBS 5.0, IT services because it represents approximately fifty-percent of the estimated contract value wherein no other primary WBS element was over twenty-percent in terms of estimated contract value.

I noted that Anadarko proposed a good technical approach, however, it was clearly not at the same level of the other offerors. They received 13 strengths that were distributed across nearly all of the functional areas. Seven of these strengths were associated with WBS 5.0 and I recognized an appropriate relative value for these strengths. However, they were assessed 7 weaknesses and they were unable to adequately address the SEB's concerns in their interim data submittal or their FPR. Thus, the SEB was unable to disposition several areas of concern. Four of these weaknesses were associated with WBS 5.0 and 5 of these weaknesses were associated with improper resource allocations. Moreover, Anadarko did not merit any significant strengths.

By contrast, BTJV's, Caelum's, and DB Consulting's proposals all received significant strengths. DB Consulting receiving 4, Caelum receiving 3, and BTJV receiving 2. Additionally, all three proposals demonstrated strengths in combination with significant strengths distributed across all, or nearly all, functional areas addressed by the evaluation criteria.

The SEB presented and I agreed that BTJV showed significant strengths in combination with strengths across the majority of the WBS areas. I noted that 1 of BTJV's significant strengths was associated with WBS 5.0 and placed a higher relative value on it. BTJV demonstrated significant strength in the areas of IT Systems Engineering, Installation, Maintenance and Operations (EIM&O), and External Relations Support. I found value to the Government in BTJV's exceptional approach to EIM&O which supports many areas of the ITAMS contract. Additionally, BTJV's approach to external relations support services provides a very comprehensive plan for managing a fluctuating workload and clearly recognizes the required resources needed. This provides value to the Government in that it ensures that support requirements will be met, especially for mission events.

BTJV also presented 21 strengths in their technical proposal. I noted a higher relative value in 7 of these strengths as they were associated with WBS 5.0. Overall, the 21 strengths, as previously stated, were distributed across the different functional areas, similar to Anadarko, DB Consulting and Caelum, and evidenced BTJV's strong understanding of the technical requirements.

Further, although BTJV presented these significant strengths and strengths, I noted two weaknesses they were unable to adequately address in their interim data submittal and their FPR. I noted that both of the weaknesses were found in WBS 5.0 and 1 weakness was related to improper resource allocations. Therefore, a higher relative value was appropriately placed on each of these weaknesses. I determined that the relative value of these weaknesses impacted BTJV's significant strengths and strengths. BTJV failed to address the high number and experience level of staffing for Planning and Integration requirements and did not provide an approach to integrate all disciplines across the contract. Additionally, they did not provide sufficient rationale for more than half of the FTEs proposed to support Application Services.

The SEB presented and I agreed that Caelum had notable significant strengths and strengths for the majority of the functional areas. I noted that 2 of Caelum's 3 significant strengths were

associated with WBS 5.0 and I placed a higher relative value on these significant strengths. I noted Caelum's significant strengths starting with their proposal of a full spectrum of IT security requirements to an exceptional degree. I found value in their strategy for providing IT Security support services decreasing the Government's risk of IT security incidents. I also found value in Caelum's approach for supporting Application Services, which I determined would significantly increase the likelihood of successful performance in this area of the contract. I found particular value in their proposed methodologies to applications development and sustaining engineering requirements. Further, Caelum demonstrated a significant strength by having proposed an array of exceptional tools and processes to ensure effective service in the General Customer Support area. I found value in the increased likelihood of Caelum successfully providing the Government exceptional general customer support.

Caelum also presented 10 strengths in their technical proposal. These strengths, as previously stated, were distributed across the different functional areas, similar to Anadarko, DB Consulting and BTJV, and evidenced their understanding of the technical requirements. I placed a higher relative value in 5 of the strengths that were associated with WBS 5.0. However, Caelum's significant strengths and strengths were impacted by their remaining and new weaknesses.

Specifically, Caelum still had 9 weaknesses that indicated a lack of a comprehensive understanding of the technical requirements. I noted that 8 of the weaknesses were related to improper resource allocations and 6 of the weaknesses were found in WBS 5.0. Therefore, a higher relative value was appropriately placed on each of these weaknesses. In several instances the proposal did not provide enough information to adequately evaluate how they would perform several critical functions with the resources proposed. Moreover, these weaknesses were identified to Caelum and still many of the weaknesses were not adequately addressed in their interim data submittal and their FFR as determined by the SEB. Additionally, while reallocating resources in an attempt to cure initial weaknesses identified to Caelum, they incurred three new weaknesses that were related to not providing sufficient rationale to justify the proposed resources.

The SEB presented and I agreed that DB Consulting demonstrated 4 significant strengths and 12 strengths across the majority of the WBS areas. I noted that 7 of their strengths and 3 of their significant strengths were associated with WBS 5.0 and I placed a higher relative value on these findings as explained above. I noted DB Consulting's significant strengths starting with their exceptional approach for developing an integrated asset management solution in support of data center automation, software license management, automated asset discovery, failure impacts, and other areas of the contract. I recognized value in this approach and agreed with the SEB that it will substantially increase the likelihood of successful contract performance. Additionally, this approach will provide the Government a deeper understanding of the IT infrastructure when assessing the impacts to that infrastructure after the failure of a configuration item and will reduce the Government's time required to initiate and maintain inventories and increase the quality of those results.

DB also received a significant strength for an exceptionally well-developed approach for IT Portfolio Management that is tightly coupled to the Enterprise Architecture (EA). The tools will also provide insight as the enterprise transitions from the "as-is" to the future state. I determined

value in this approach as it will provide a benefit to the Government in that the portfolio managers will have the information needed to make better portfolio decisions.

The SEB also determined that DB Consulting's exceptional methodology proposed to Scenario 2, JSC IT Governance Framework merited a significant strength. The SEB was particularly impressed with DB Consulting's approach to Configuration Management, which was described as a closed loop process with end-to-end configuration accountability. I recognized value and agreed with the SEB's assessment of this approach to Configuration Management.

The last significant strength given to DB Consulting was for their approach for External Relations Support Services which would appreciably increase resource efficiencies as well as increase the likelihood of successful performance in this WBS area. I determined value in this approach for many reasons including efficiency aspects during work surges and mission critical times.

I did note that DB Consulting, after being informed of their weaknesses, did not provide sufficient information in their interim data submittal or their FPR to remove all weaknesses. They had one remaining weakness in WBS 5.0. Specifically, they failed to provide sufficient detail for their technical approach for the operational requirements for IT Security Maintenance and Operations. A higher relative value was placed on this weakness because it was in WBS 5.0, but I noted that this weakness was not related to an improper resource allocation. The SEB considered DB Consulting still strong in the area of IT and offering the highest qualitative value to the Government in regard to the technical subfactor. Based on my comparative assessment of the proposals in terms of the technical subfactor as detailed above, I agreed with this assessment. It is for these reasons, I determined that DB Consulting provided a qualitative advantage over the other offerors in their technical approach.

Moving to the management approach subfactor, Anadarko, Caelum and DB Consulting were all assessed significant strengths. While BTJV received adjectival rating of "Good" for this subfactor, it did not, however, merit any significant strengths. Additionally, the SEB provided BTJV a weakness because their approach of ensuring that all professional certifications would be in place at the end of the phase-in period was insufficient. I agreed and found that this provided risk of unsuccessful contract performance at contract start to the Government. Anadarko was provided one significant strength for its proposed organizational structure with highly effective levels of approval and flow of authority. Further, Anadarko received 7 strengths. While Anadarko received an adjectival rating of "Very Good", DB Consulting and Caelum each received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" for this subfactor.

Both DB Consulting and Caelum each merited two significant strengths. DB Consulting received 13 strengths and Caelum received 10 strengths. Both Offeror's warranted a significant strength in the area of Configuration Management. Caelum was also recognized for its significant strength in proposing an innovative software tool for managing work and resources that will enable enhanced cost and project progress measurement.

DB Consulting received a significant strength for their exceptional phase-in plan which ensured "operational readiness" at contract start. The phase-in plan was very thorough and provided for a

multi-channel communication plan with the Government. Communication is of particular importance in ensuring a smooth transition with the current contracts and ITAMS. It was also noted by the SEB, and I agreed, the proposed plan provided a very sound staffing plan that included certification and training and a very thorough risk assessment. This outstanding approach will substantially increase the likelihood of a successful phase-in period and successful contract performance from the start. I noted that Caelum did merit a strength for their phase-in plan, however, it was not as comprehensive as DB Consultant's phase-in plan.

Both Offerors (i.e., DB Consulting and Caelum) received strengths for their approaches to their management reporting structure, management of team members (including subcontractors), management of projects that placed an emphasis on performance metrics, and reproducible processes. Both Offerors also proposed management of personnel that will gain efficiencies in operations and better enable the Government to meet peak demands on resources. Additionally, DB Consulting provided a detailed assessment of their management approach for DRD requirements which will increase the likelihood of meeting contract deliverables. Both Offerors also provided similar strengths in their approach of keeping the Government knowledgeable of emerging technologies and technology advancements. They similarly received strengths for recognizing the need to plan effectively for integration and transition of future work. They also provided similar value to the Government in their approaches to managing IT security and thus reducing the risks of security incidents. In addition to IT security, DB Consulting also provided a highly effective program for managing risks overall for the ITAMs contract. Moreover, DB Consulting's proposed management structure for Safety and Health and Quality Management functions is particularly highlighted in their management approach. These are areas that are also of value to the Government.

DB Consulting was recognized for providing management tools that would facilitate access to contract management and customer service data. It will also facilitate decision-making of financial information and performance metrics and measures. Thus, facilitating the overall administration of the contract. Caelum provided an effective approach for proactively managing contract performance in the area of customer service which identifies both positive and negative trends which will decrease the likelihood of chronic problems across the contract and provide an overall service to the Government.

DB Consulting further proposed an overall organizational structure that provides appropriate levels of reporting and accountability and facilitates internal communications. Moreover, their management plan also proposed developing and maintaining external interfaces with the Government. Communication being key to contract performance, the SEB found value to these two approaches, and I agreed.

Additionally, DB Consulting received no weaknesses, while Caelum did not fully address a weakness in their FPR. Caelum failed to provide a schedule for initiating Associate Contractor Agreements (ACAs) reducing the Government's ability to completely evaluate their approach for establishing ACAs. For all of these reasons, I determined that DB Consulting provided a qualitative advantage over the other offerors in their management approach.

Next, I considered the staffing/key personnel subfactor in mission suitability. I noted that DB Consulting and Caelum each received an adjectival rating of "Good" and their adjective and numerical ratings were identical in this subfactor, with neither receiving a significant strength. However, Anadarko and BTJV each received an adjectival rating of "Very Good". I further noted that both Anadarko and BTJV each merited a significant strength in this subfactor for their proposed program manager. Both managers have direct experience in the same type of work and demonstrate the qualification required to be successful as ITAMS Program Managers. Additionally, Anadarko was assessed two strengths in this factor for their compensation package and proposed Information Management and External Relations Manager. For these reasons, I determined that Anadarko provided a qualitative advantage over the other offerors with regard to the staffing/key personnel subfactor.

I then turned my analysis to the safety and health subfactor in mission suitability. Caelum, BTJV and Anadarko all provided adequate safety and health plans and were assessed with the adjectival rating of "Good". However, DB Consulting excelled above the other offerors in this area and received an adjectival rating of "Excellent". DB Consulting proposed an outstanding safety and health plan that will add value to its overall performance by ensuring the safety and health of its employees and ensure the reduction of injuries and illnesses. DB Consulting received a significant strength for their safety and health plan. The plan fully integrates its safety and health program with its Quality system that positions DB Consulting to capitalize on the synergies of the two areas. DB Consulting further links safety and health not only to customer requirements but also customer satisfaction. They also proposed a continuous updating approach to trend analysis. DB Consulting's safety and health program overall addresses key areas of behavior based safety principles which, the Government may capitalize on and adopt as a best practice. This has value to the Government in that it will further strengthen the overall safety and health program, which will reduce the potential for mishaps and incidents, and promote a safe work environment. For these reasons, I determined that DB Consulting provided a qualitative advantage over the other offerors with regard to the safety and health subfactor.

Past Performance

Having completed my analysis under the mission suitability factor, I next considered past performance, the other non/price factor. The SEB had rated DB Consulting's past performance "Very High," Caelum's "High," BTJV's "High," and Anadarko's "Very High." Anadarko, BTJV and Caelum were merited significant strengths for demonstrating highly pertinent performance of an exceptional merit in a broad range of relevant areas of work to ITAMS. Similarly, DB Consulting received a significant strength for providing past performance data that demonstrates highly pertinent performance of an exceptional merit in General Customer Support and Information Technology work which, the SEB noted and I agreed, also covered a broad range of relevant areas of work to ITAMS.

Caelum and BTJV also received weaknesses for past performance issues. After a lengthy and comprehensive discussion, I determined their significant strengths were reduced by these weaknesses. Caelum provided a past performance reference relating to work on the Goddard Earth Science and Technology Consortium contract at Goddard Space Flight Center. The reference stated he would not select the contractor for future work due to various administrative

issues. Although the Offeror assured the SEB during discussion they have taken steps to fix the issue, I determined this matter presented a substantive risk to the Government. Similarly BTJV's received a weakness that was also related to administrative issues. Additionally, information was not provided by BTJV in their FPR to attempt to mitigate the weakness. These weaknesses decrease the Government's confidence of successful management and cost performance under the contract.

I further noted the value of the strengths that were given to Anadarko (two) and DB Consulting (four). DB Consulting received strengths related to effective past performance of their subcontractors in the areas of customers support services, enterprise architecture, multimedia operations and services, and information management. Both Anadarko's subcontractor, Abacus Technology, and DB Consulting's subcontractor, Wyle, demonstrated to have pertinent and relevant experience and effective performance in Capability Maturity Model integration (CMMI) Level III and Multimedia Engineering, Installation and Maintenance. Anadarko received a second strength for their team member Blackhawk's experience in IT Security. After considering all of the information stated above, I agree that all four offeror's adjectival ratings for past performance were consistent with the information provided by the SEB.

Cost/Price

All of the four offerors adequately addressed initial cost concerns during discussions which were corrected in their interim data submittal and the corrections were incorporated into their FPR. The SEB was also able to disposition several areas of concern with all offerors. Thus, all of the four offerors had increased the SEB confidence rating of the final probable cost from a low level of confidence to a level of high. Overall, all offerors submitted very realistic cost proposals and only minor probable cost adjustments were warranted.

Conclusion

A cost/technical trade-off between the proposals was necessary. I examined all the SEB's findings and we discussed at length various aspects of those findings so I could completely understand and confirm the value and risks associated with the proposals. Central to my decision was my consideration of the value and risks discussed above, all in the context of the RFP's stated evaluation criteria. I determined that DB Consulting held a clear advantage over the other offerors in mission suitability and had a very high past performance confidence rating. DB Consulting had the second to lowest probable cost, but only slightly higher (on a percentage basis) than the lowest probable cost under the cost/price factor. The provisions of the RFP dictated my approach to making the necessary trade-off between the proposals.

As provided in the RFP, of the three evaluation factors, mission suitability and past performance when combined are significantly more important than cost. Mission suitability is more important than past performance.

I reviewed and accepted the evaluation of the SEB. My decision recognized and was fully consistent with the weight given to Mission Suitability in the selection criteria of the RFP. The value identified in DB Consulting's proposal, particularly in the mission suitability subfactors of technical, safety and health, and management, appeared very credible. Their technical approach

demonstrated an effective, sound, feasible, and efficient technical approach for implementing Enterprise Architecture (EA) at the enterprise level which will help JSC comply with Agency directive NPD 2830.1, NASA Enterprise Architecture. DB Consulting's proposal demonstrated an understanding of the requirements and its exceptionally well-developed approach is a strong predictor of successful performance in this area of the contract. DB Consulting also provided a sound and effective approach for supporting Scenario 2, JSC IT Governance Framework, providing the Government with an exceptional quality process and methodology with effective automation that improves end-to-end board management and overall efficiency. Furthermore, DB Consulting proposed a sound and effective technical approach which provides staffing and resource efficiencies for External Relations Support Services (WBS 8.0), appreciably increasing the likelihood of successful contract performance in this area. Lastly, DB Consulting proposed an approach for developing an integrated asset management solution in support of data center automation, software license management, automated asset discovery, impact relationships, and other areas of the contract. DB Consulting's strengths and significant strengths evidence a particular advantage in IT services which is pertinent to the successful performance of this contract. I considered DB Consulting's technical approach the largest discriminator between the proposals within mission suitability for the reasons explained above. DB Consulting's management approach was qualitatively higher than the other offerors, however, it was not given as much weight as the technical approach subfactor. In particular, I found value to their proposed phase-in plan. The plan was very thorough. It provided for a multi-channel communication plan with the Government, in addition to a very sound staffing plan and thorough risk assessment. This outstanding approach will substantially increase the likelihood of ensuring a smooth transition and successful contract performance from the start. While I felt Anadarko provided the strongest staffing/key personnel approach, their strength in this area was not significant enough to overcome their weaknesses, particularly in their technical approach. Moreover, DB Consulting was the only offeror to provide an outstanding safety and health plan that will add value to DB's overall performance by ensuring the safety and health of DB Consulting's employees and ensure the reduction of injuries and illnesses overall for the Government. In sum, it was apparent that DB Consulting's proposal provides a substantial qualitative benefit in mission suitability over the other proposals.

As previously discussed, I also determined past performance to be consistent with the information presented by the SEB. DB Consulting and Anadarko both had a "Very High" level of confidence for past performance. However, Anadarko's confidence rating in this area was not significant enough to overcome their weaknesses found in mission suitability as explained above. Additionally, mission suitability is more important than past performance, and as previously stated, it was apparent that DB Consulting's proposal provides a substantial qualitative benefit in

mission suitability over the other proposals. I accordingly did not determine past performance to be a significant discriminator.

I noted that the non-cost/price factors were significantly more important than cost/price. Although Caelum has a slightly lower probable cost than DB Consulting, I accordingly determined that the significant qualitative non-cost price benefits represented by the DB Consulting proposal measurably outweigh its slightly higher cost. I therefore select DB Consulting for award.

Ellen Ochoa

Ellen Ochoa
Source Selection Authority

20 Aug 2010

Date